Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 GENEVA 02804 041101Z

13
ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ISO-00 CU-04 CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-07 H-03

INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03

SS-20 USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 OMB-01

ACDA-19 SAM-01 DRC-01 (ISO) W
---------- 038269
R 041000Z MAY 74
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 5551
INFO ALL CSCE CAPITALS 132
AMEMBASSY OSLO
USNMR SHAPE
USDOCSOUTH
USLOSACLANT NORFOLD VIRGINIA
USCINCEUR
CINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L GENEVA 2804

VIENNA ALSO FOR USDEL MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: PFOR
SUBJECT: CSCE: SOVIET VIEWS ON MILITARY CONFIDENCE-
BUILDING MEASURES (CMB'S)

REF: STATE 081134

1. SUMMARY. IN CONVERSATION WITH US DEL, SOVIET REPS AGREED
TO OUR PREFERRED PHRASING ON NATURE OF CBM OBLIGATION. ON MANEUVERS,
THEY STUCK TO BORDER-AREA APPROACH, MENTIONING POSSIBILITY OF
300 KILOMETER WIDTH. ON SIZE OF FORCES, THEY SAID "ARMY CORPS"
COULD INCLUDE AS LITTEL AS TWO DIVISIONS. THEY OPPOSED
ROMANIAN PROPOSAL ON PARA 24 BECAUSE IT UNDERCUT MBFR TALKS.
END SUMMARY.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 GENEVA 02804 041101Z

2. IN ACCORDANCE WITH SUGGESTION REFTEL, USDEL INVITED

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

SOVIETS FOR MEETING AT US MISSION TO DISCUSS NATURE OF OBLI-
GATION ON CBM'S. STACHEVSKIY AND MIKHAILOV TOOK PART IN
DISCUSSION. USDEL OUTLINED LEGAL PROBLEMS OF "WILL"AND
"SHALL" AND PROPOSED FORMULATION "EXPRESS THEIR FIRM
INTENTION" BEGIN BRACKETS "VYRAZHAYUT SVOYE TVERDIYE -AMERENIYE
END BRAKETS. INITIALLY, STACHEVSKIY SAID HE SAW NO PROBLEMS WITH THIS
AND AT END OF CONVERSATION, MIKHAILOV SAID WE COULD COUNT
ON SOVIET SUPPORT. INCIDENTALLY, STACHEVSKIY MADE CLEAR
THAT SOVIETS, DESPITE VOLUNTARY NATURE OF OBLIGATION, PLAN
TO ISSUE OFFICEAL INSTRUCTIONS TO APPROPRIATE AUTHOR-
ITIES THAT MANEUVERES BE NOTIFIED IN ALL CASES WHERE THEY MEET
AGREED CRITERIA. THEY WOULD NOT EVADE OBLIGATION, EVEN IF
IT WAS MORAL RATHER THAN LEGAL. USDEL SAID THIS WAS OUR
INTENTION AS WELL.

3. SOVIETS THEN TOOK OCCASION TO DISCUSS OTHER ASPECTS OF
CBM PROBLEM. ON GEOGRAPHIC AREA, THEY STUCK CLOSELY TO
POSITION THAT ONLY MANEUVERS IN BORDER AREAS SHOULD BE
COVERED. THE WIDTH OF THIS AREA COULD BE NEGOTIATED.
STACHEVSKIY INITIALLY MENTIONED 25 KILOMETERS, BUT LATER
REFERRED TO 300 KILOMETERS AS A POSSIBLE WIDTH. USDEL SAID
THAT WE HAD MAJOR PROBLEMS WITH SOVIET BORDER-AREA APPROACH.
HE ASKED WHETHER SOVIET PURPOSE WAS TO EXCLUDE MANEUVERS IN
EASTERN EUROPE OR ON SOVIET TERRITORY ONLY. SOVIETS RESPONDED
BOTH WERE INTENDED AND DEFENDED PROPOSAL ALONG STANDARD LINES
THAT ONLY MANEUVERS IN PROXIMITY TO OTHER STATES COULD
CAUSE ANXIETY. USDEL STRESSED THAT MOBILITY OF MODERN ARMIES
LED US TO CONCLUSION THAT "IN EUROPE" FORMULA WAS ONLY
APPROACH WHICH WOULD HEIGHTEN CONFIDENCE.

4. PROBING OF SOVIET POSITION ON SIZE OF FORCES LED TO
STATEMENT BY MIKHAILOV THAT "ARMY CORPS" IN
SOVIET DEFINITION COULD BE AS A SMALL AS TWO DIVISIONS.
SOVIETS DID NOT WANT TO NOTIFY "TACTICAL" MANEUVERS, WHICH
WERE ONE DIVISION AND LESS. THEY WOULD AGREE TO NOTIFY
"TACTICAL-OPERATIONAL" MANEUVERS WHICH HAD A FIELD COMMAND.
WHEN USDEL ASKED WHETHER THE SOVIET CONCEPT OF A "CORPS" HAD
NOT BEEN DROPPED FROM SOVIET MILITARY PRACTICE, MIKHAILOV
SAID IT HAD BEEN JOINED WITH "ARMY" IN CONCEPT OF "ARMY
CORPS," WHICH IN FACT CORRESPONDED TO WESTERN PRACTICE.
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 GENEVA 02804 041101Z

STACHEVSKIY STRESSED FIRMNESS OF SOVIET POSITION ON SIZE.
HE SAID OTHER COUNTRIES COULD AGREE TO NOTIFY AT LOWER
LEVEL AMONG THEMSELVES; HOWEVER, SOVIETS COULD NOT ACCEPT
NOTIFICATION OF TACTICAL MANEUVERS. HE ARGUED FOR STEP-BY-
STEP APPROACH, SUGGESTING THAT FOLLOW-ON CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
ALONG LINES OF CZECH PROPOSAL COULD RETURN TO CBM QUESTION
LATER. USDEL SAID WE DID NOT AGREE WITH CREATION OF PERMANENT
COMMITTEE FOR THIS PURPOSE BUT NOTED STABILIZING

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

MEASURES WOULD OF COURSE BE DISCUSSED IN MBFR CONTEXT.

5. QUESTIONED BY SOVIETS ON US POSITION REGARDING MOVEMENTS, USDEL REPLIED WE CONTINUED TO STUDY THE QUESTION. SOVIETS SAID THEIR PROPOSAL FOR SHELVING MOVEMENTS ISSUE WAS SUBJECT TO SLIGHT MODIFICATIONS IF THESE WERE NECESSARY TO WIN APPROVAL OF OTHERS.

6. ASKED FOR USSR POSITION ON BROAD ROMAINIAN PARA 24 PROPOSAL, SOVIETS REPLIED THAT THEY DID NOT OPPOSE LISTING OF PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES. IN FACT, THESE WERE ALMOST ENTIRELY LIFTED OUT OF 1966 STATEMENT OF WARSAW PACT POLITICAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE. HOWEVER, THEY WERE OPPOSED TO OPERATIVE PART OF ROMANIAN PROPOSAL, WHICH THEY FELT WOULD UNDERMINE MBFR TALKS.

7. COMMENT: SOVIETS SHOWED CONSIDERABLE FRUSTRATION WITH WHAT THEY TERMED THE "MAXIMALIST" POSITIONS OF SOME COUNTRIES ON CMB'S. AT ONE POINT, MIKHAILOV SAID FRANKLY THE USSR WAS NOT PREPARED TO HAMSTRING THE FLEXIBILITY OF ITS MILITARY FORCES. THE SOVIETS WOULD CLEARLY LIKE TO ENTICE US INTO ACCEPTING THEIR BORDER-ZONE CONCEPT BY HOLDING OUT THE PROSPECT OF MAKING IT WIDE ENOUGH TO INCULDE MANEUVERS OF POTENTIAL CONCERN. ALTHOUGH THEIR POSITION ON SIZE REMAINS FIRM, THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN IT AND THE UK PROPOSAL MAY IN PRACTICE BE NO MORE THAN ONE DIVISION. IN THE END, IT IS POSSIBLE THAT THE SOVIETS WOULD SETTLE FOR A DEFINITION SUCH AS "MORE THAN ONE DIVISION"WHICH WOULD EXCLUDE NOTIFICATION OF THEIR "TACTICAL"MANEUVERS. END COMMENT.
DALE

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MILITARY AGREEMENTS, MILITARY PLANS, FOREIGN POLICY POSITION, MEETINGS, PROPOSALS (BID), MILITARY POLICIES, DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 04 MAY 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974GENEVA02804
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D740108-0423
From: GENEVA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740574/aaaacods.tel
Line Count: 145
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: STATE 081134
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 19 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <19 MAR 2002 by smithrj>; APPROVED <07 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE: SOVIET VIEWS ON MILITARY CONFIDENCE- BUILDING MEASURES (CMB'S)
TAGS: PFOR, MILI, UR, RO
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005